This economic picture indicates that from early childhood, women had engaged in such physical labor that by 18 years of age they had strong muscles and backs through lifting, stooping, and squatting. Since to stop work during pregnancy was construed as laziness, women worked vigorously up to the day of delivery. If a woman were delivered during one of the hectic seasons, she might shorten her post-natal rest to whatever she thought was a safe minimum.

Marriage

As people of the community often met at the temple, at ceremonies, and at work parties, there too young people met. Unmarried girls went freely and often alone on duties about the community, and also to Minburi to sell vegetables or take a load of paddy to the mill. To temple fairs and such they went in groups. Though parents hoped their children would marry within the community, a few young people "married out."

Girls were married between 17 and 27 or so, most frequently around 21 to 23. Since boys at 21 might have to serve 2 years in the army, and were urged to spend as well at least a few months in the priesthood, their marriages took place between 22 and 30, most often around 24 or so. Parents were in no hurry to marry off their green children at the very age when their productivity was funneling wealth back into the family. However, if male help in the family were short, parents were more receptive to suitors. No girl was married against her wishes nor to a stranger.[4] Marriages might be arranged through formal conversations opened by the man's family and carried on through a go-between, but the girl had the final say. A secret agreement between the partners might even precede negotiations. About half of the marriages were elopements, sometimes arranged because negotiations were dragging, sometimes to avoid the higher costs of more formal arrangements. Marriage, though largely based on socio-economic factors (Phillips:62) was not devoid of personal esteem. Sharp (Bang Chan data at Cornell) has a note on the desirable qualities in a husband as viewed by women. "Sexual virility," last on the list, was minimized in relation to such qualities as "religiousness," "wealth," "industriousness," which headed the list.

4. A person who uses magical means to force an unwilling woman's love "will be born 500 times as a mad dog."

12

581 589 It was not felt necessary to marry. Because of the strong economic position of women, a few spinsters had their own homes, farmed their own lands, enlisting nephews and nieces to help, or hiring as needed, and entered fully into the social life of the area. Others lived with relatives and assisted in the maintenance of a larger household unit. Some men, too, never married. [593] One group of grown siblings of both sexes stated they were "too happy together to marry."

836 848 Pre-marital chastity was more or less observed. If a girl became pregnant before marriage, her parents brought pressure, usually successful, on the boy to marry her. The occasional illegitimate child was raised without stigma in the girl's family, though problems arose during pregnancy and delivery (cf. "cone of wood" below). The mother later found a husband. One father was angered because he felt his daughter's pregnancy wrecked her chance for a marriage of prestige. He was conspicuous for his social aspirations towards city ways.

864 831 Information on human sexual matters was gathered by the young sometimes by accidental observation of parents and others, through hints from [illegible]aring cursing, and by conversations with grandparents, older siblings, and friends of the same sex. Men joked on sex matters at the all-male rice-uprooting parties. Being antithetic to the ascetic prescriptions of Buddhism, sex talk was highly charged. Sex was never discussed in mixed company.

Residence

592 The nuclear family of husband, wife, and unmarried children was the primary social and productive unit, but other resident kinship units larger and smaller also occurred. After marriage, [591] the couple usually lived for a time in the house of the parents of one spouse or the other; then, as soon as they could afford it, set up housekeeping in their own house. Of a sample of 98 families in Bang Chan, 30 set up independent households at once after marriage, 16 after one year, and the rest, a few per year, on throughout 10 years; 15 of the families never had a house of their own but lived with other relatives (Janlekha:37). Of 298 families, 59.4 per cent lived independently as a nuclear family, while 34.9 per cent lived with other relatives in the house. (The remaining were single persons living alone, or priests at the temple in the "ecclesiastical family.") The average size of the households (not necessarily the nuclear families) was 5.7 persons, with a range of 1 to 14, the median being 6 (ibid. 28-29). 361 The house of a new couple was usually built adjacent to parents or relatives, and certainly within calling distance or sight of some other household. Social 621 patterns of cooperative work, borrowing, and visiting kept adjacent households, whether kin, co-religionists or not, in

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

the villagers is contrasted with those cases of separation or divorce which are viewed as resulting more from social psychological reasons: arguments, contrariness, general incompatability, and wasting or not sharing money. The squandering of money is a most frequent cause of family discord contributing to family dissolution, especially when it involves the three aphoristic evils of Thai life: women, whiskey, and opium (although, in fact, I know of only two cases where Bang Chaners have been reputed to smoke opium).

Precise figures on the divorce or separation rate in Bang Chan are unknown, primarily because many marriages as well as divorces are never registered on the government rolls; also, many separations seem to follow an on-again-off-again pattern; the sanctioned occurrence of polygyny (only eight known cases out of the 296 families) and even polyandry (two known cases) complicates the problem even further. However, the fact that *four months* after I had designated a sample of thirty families from which to select informants, six of those families, or 20 percent of the sample population, had dissolved would strongly suggest that Bang Chan families are not particularly stable.

The causes of family fission in these specific cases are unknown, but what is impressive is the apparent ease with which it takes place and the equanimity with which people seem to accept it. Other informants, reporting their own experiences or observations, discuss family breakups as if they were among the more normal events of the workaday world and completely understandable. They seem to be of no greater emotional import—in the sense of eliciting recognizable feelings of distress—than losing a good price on the sale of a piece of land or on the sale of some rice. In fact, the latter kinds of situations are considerably more likely to evoke expressions of hurt or exasperation. One repeatedly encounters in Bang Chan instances on the following order: a family breaks up simply because the husband has an inclination to work for a particular person whom he likes; a wife ("she is a touchy woman") runs away every time she has a minor disagreement with her husband (minor even by village standards, for example, "Should I buy my lottery tickets from Mr. X or Mr. Y?"; "Should we invite seven monks or ten monks to officiate at this ceremony?"). The point here is that these explanations—and the low tolerance for discord, the importance to a person of a boss or job over a spouse, the desire to be footloose, which they imply—are to the villagers completely reasonable justifications for the dissolution of family units.

Many of the family relationships referred to above as "centripetal" in nature are clearly related to or derived from patterns of social organization characteristic of an earlier Bang Chan. Although most evidence indicates that even in the years immediately following the settlement of the village in

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

596 *156 As the reader might by now suspect, it is not easy to determine the basis of the unity of the family. However, of all the factors that keep people living together in amity and affection, two come to the fore: a sense of love, obligation, and respect that is derived from the simple fact of kinship, but which must be continuously confirmed by mutual benefits; and economic considerations.

596 476 The economic foundation of the family is significant not only because the family is in fact the sole economic and occupational unit in the community (with the exception of the monkhood and school) but because the villagers themselves think of the family in terms of its economic functions. People say that they marry for wealth or because of the productive capacities of their spouses;[18] spouses stay together because the economic costs of a split are too great; most important of all, people are keenly *aware* of their economic interdependence. Fathers say that they need children to work in the fields and care for the buffalos, that a family needs a mother so that its members will be fed, that siblings are useful because it is easy to borrow from them (although, as noted earlier, some are unhappy about the intrusion of the kinship tie into what they regard to be a commercial transaction). Many villagers extend this economic, transactional type of thinking to other aspects of the kinship relationship. Thus they say that "the purpose of marriage is to have a companion who will take care of you when you get sick," or very frequently that "my parents went to the trouble of bringing me up so they would have a person to make merit for them when they die." The emphasis here is on independent agents serving each other because it is mutually beneficial.

[581] [593] [581] [593]

*156 181 171 591 The love and affection that people feel for each other is of course grounded in the close associations that one finds in most nuclear families. However, the attitudes of respect that one sees are perhaps more distinctively Thai. Almost all the literature on Thailand refers, at one point or another, to the patterns of respect (*khwaamnabthyy*) existing between people, both within and without the family. These patterns are based, in the first instance, on the status inequalities that exist in almost all social

---

[125] [18] In responding to the unstructured Sentence Completion Test item, "*He* (*she*) *wants to get a wife* (*husband*) *who. . . .*" for example, thirty-one of sixty informants indicated that they wanted a mate who "was a good worker," "earned a living," "was rich," or otherwise had high socio-economic status. Only two persons said that they wanted a spouse for reasons that could be reasonably defined as sentimental: one woman wanted a husband who "would be a good friend with whom she could discuss things," and a man said he wanted a wife whom "he loved." Other informants gave completions distributed among a variety of categories: "polite, well-mannered, handsome, kind, strong, and good" spouses; and six women wanted husbands who would be faithful.

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

114 157 156 as do rejected lovers who fear suffering again. Without strong bonds, they develop no sense of guilt for those they injure and stand ultimately responsible only to themselves, individuals among individuals who differ mainly in the amount of influence they wield. Thus Dang [the informant] can make demands of others but feels little obligation toward them. As he left his father and uncle with scarcely a second thought, so others can leave him. Of course, as was indicated by Dang's projective test data, this form of individualism is not entirely without its psychic toll. But on the level of action and conscious decision, the moral for a Thai runs: invest not thy love in a shadow.

114 156 155 866 The piece by this writer (Phillips, 1959) is essentially an amplification of some of the findings of the above paper and a confirmation, in the life histories of two other informants, of their typicality. The paper was confined to an examination of the development and expression of the needs for dependence and independence in the lives of these villagers. Three major points emerged from the analysis. First, the most common expression of dependence was in the area of subsistence and economics, in the individual's desire to attach himself to others who would give him sustenance in return for services rendered. Over and over again, the informants viewed their relationships with other people, particularly kin, in terms of the others' economic value to themselves. However, this mode of dependence was not so much an overriding compulsion as it was a basic postulate about human relationships: the measure of another person's love was explicitly the degree to which in material terms he served the self. The second point, [581] in contrast to the above, was that marriage was seen as the means by which a person could free himself from the obligations of economic dependence. This freedom has two aspects: freedom from the frustrations caused by others; and freedom to set oneself up as master of one's own household, thus reaping the psychological satisfactions—status, power, and prestige—of having others dependent on oneself. The third and perhaps most striking point concerned the fact that all these informants spent their childhoods being shuttled from one family to another. Although this experience may not have been culturally modal, it occurred with sufficient frequency to be a possibility for every Bang Chan child. It was further suggested that in [571] part such experiences taught villagers at a very early age that they had to fend for themselves, and that the experiences served as psychological prototypes for the sense of fragility of social relationships that is so characteristic of village life.

114 124 In contrast to most of the literature cited above, the last two articles are based on data which are products of interviews heavily weighted toward the psychologically expressive. Two of the informants admitted that they told us things that they had never shared with anyone, and the agitation (a

4:Phillips E-4,5 (1956-1957) 1966
AO7 Central Thai AO7
Bang Chan

1923–1924], translated by Cunnison) and Homans (1961) have argued, that human relationships everywhere are based on just such a consideration, usually concealed by ethically palatable amenities (such as in American culture, from which most of Homans' empirical materials come). However, what is so intriguing about the Thai case is that *quid pro quo* factors are forever in mind as justifications and explanations of why people relate to one another. Although villagers, because they are such polite people, rarely say to others, "I am helping you because I know the day will come when I need your help," or "Do this for me because you owe me a favor," they do use such arguments *to explain* the basis of their ties: "Of all my friends I love Lek the most because she has done me the most favors (*bunkhuun*)"; "The purpose of marriage is to have a companion who will take care of you when you get sick"; "Of all my daughters, the one who gives me the greatest pleasure is the one who sells things. . . . When she gets money she gives it to me"; "Friends are very useful because it means that you have people who will do you favors. And when they need help, you will take care of them. This is love." [21]

One of the finest discussions of the nature of reciprocal obligations appears in a recent paper by George M. Foster (1961) that deals not with a Thai community, but with the Mexican village of Tzintzuntzan. Foster outlines in his paper the notion of the "dyadic contract" which he presents as a model for the social structure of Tzintzuntzan. Or, more precisely: "Specifically, I suggest a model . . . to reconcile the institutionalized roles which can be recognized and described in the community with the underlying principle which gives the social system coherence." Foster's focus thus differs somewhat from our psychological emphasis. However, his abstract statement of the "dyadic contract" provides such an excellent summation of the major factor making for enduring social relationships in Bang Chan that it merits quoting in detail here. There are of course inevitable differences in cultural content between the two communities and the fact that

[21] Such explanations are not unique to Bang Chan. In his description of the Thai–Lue village of Ban Phaed in Northern Thailand, Moerman (1962) observes: "The society of Ban Phaed operates in terms of something got for every something given. This is not merely an analytic device which permits a predictive, if crass, view of any human society. It is the way in which villagers explain and evaluate their own behavior. Favor for favor, visit for visit, meal for meal, one should return what he receives. 'We help our kinsmen because they help us. If a kinsman however close didn't help me, I wouldn't help him.' 'We care for our children when they are young; they will care for us when we are old.' Actions which we would justify in terms of compassion, generosity, public-spirit, patriotism, pride in a job well done, the Lue villager speaks of in terms of reciprocal, short-term self-interest. Their actions are no more selfish than ours. Far from it. But the moral rhetoric of a Lue villager is different from our own. In politics, economics, family life, and religion it focuses on something got for something given."

178 These five cases may be grouped as follows: two
592 cases of relatives of family heads separating from 'extended'
621 families, two cases of one spouse leaving the other, and one case of a family head deserting his wife and children.

Pattern of Establishment of New Families

593 Bangchan offspring customarily continued to live with
592 their parents as long as they were not married regardless of how old they might be. In the eyes of the parents, an offspring is always their child, immature and needing parental supervision, as long as he has not been able to acquire a spouse; and until then the parents-offspring mutual obligations, necessitating living together, must continue to exist. Thus, it was not uncommon to see several unmarried adults crowding in one family providing too large a labor force relative to a small parcel of land on which the family worked. In this context, marriage serves an important economic function of giving impetus to the start of new producing units in the village. There is no corresponding service in areas where the extended family system predominates such as in China and India.

583 Two distinct kinds of marriage were conceived of in Bangchan: the conventional marriage with the sanction of parents or guardians of both parties which was usually preceded by formal arrangement and accompanied by marriage rites sponsored by the bride's family; and the popular marriage by mutual understanding between the man and wife without